The National Policy.

A PRACTICAL VIEW

BY

A PRACTICAL MAN.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY LEWIS WIGLE, M. P.

(Member for South Essex, Ont.)

IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF CANADA,

MARCH, 1884.

OTTAWA, CANADA:

Printed by the CITIZEN Printing and Publishing Co., 31 Metcalfe Street.

1884

F5012.1884.W637

The EDITH *and* LORNE PIERCE
COLLECTION *of* CANADIANA

Queen's University at Kingston

THE NATIONAL POLICY.

A PRACTICAL VIEW

BY

A PRACTICAL MAN.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY LEWIS WIGLE, M.P.

(Member for South Essex, Ont.)

IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF CANADA,

MARCH, 1884.

OTTAWA, CANADA.
Printed by the CITIZEN Printing and Publishing Company, 31 Metcalfe Street.

1884.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/addresspresenta00york

Mr. Lewis Wigle's Speech.

[The following speech, delivered by Mr. Lewis Wigle, M.P. for South Essex, has been published by a number of gentlemen who listened to the masterly effort delivered by him in the House of Commons, Ottawa, in March last.]

Mr. WIGLE said :—Mr. Speaker, I do not think I would say anything on this occasion if it were not that hon. gentlemen opposite constantly run down the National Policy, and claim that the manufactured products of this country are not cheaper than they were before the National Policy was introduced. This is the second time we have heard from the hon. menber for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on this subject, and he has challenged any hon. member to show that goods are cheaper now than before the introduction of the National Policy.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

THE TRADE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WIGLE. And the hon. gentleman always quotes the trade policy of the United States. What produced the National Policy of the United States? We find that in 1789, they started with a revenue tariff of 8½ per cent.; a year or two afterwards it was increased to 11½ per cent.; in 1792 it was further advanced to 13½ per cent.; and in 1816 they commenced their National Policy. What caused them to inaugurate that policy in 1816? It was the war of 1812. They found they were depending on England for the guns with which to fight her, for the powder and shot for the army, for cloth for the clothing of the soldiers, for blankets to cover the troops; and so they settled the war question, and immediately afterwards they inaugurated the National Policy, which averaged 21 per cent. That continued for four years. After the next presidential election in 1820, what did the manufacturers of England do? They rented warehouses at the seat of Government in the United States and brought manufactured goods there to prove that they could not be manufactured cheaper in the United States. What did the people of the United States say? They said if we ever intend to be a great, prosperous and independent nation, we must bring manufactures to this country, so that our people will be benefited by having the factories established here. They said we do not object to English manufacturers selling goods here, but to our people being compelled to take their farm produce to England,

leave the money there and bring back manufactured goods. We have no objection to English manufacturers selling goods to the people of the United States, they said, but we intend to impose such high protective duties as will compel English manufacturers to come to the United States and manufacture their goods, and thus our people will spend their money at home. In 1820 the tariff was advanced to 26 per cent. Four years afterwards it was increased to 38 per cent.; in 1828 to 42 per cent.; 1832 the compromise tariff was introduced, which was on a sliding scale for 10 years, reducing 2 per cent. per annum, which had the effect of diminishing the duties from 42 per cent. to 20 per cent. After the ten years the tariff was increased to 33 per cent., then it was reduced to 24 per cent., and in 1857 it was reduced to a revenue tariff of 19 per cent. In 1861 it was decreased, and in 1872 it was increased. What is it to-day? It averages 40 per cent. on cottons, over 61 per cent. on cloths, over 53 per cent. on carpets, and on leaf tobacco grown in any other country, 35 cents per pound. If the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite be correct, the consumers of leaf tobacco in the United States must pay 35 cents per pound additional. What is the Tariff to-day in this country? On woollen blankets and cloths, 7½ cents per lb. and 20 per cent.; cottons, 35 per cent. and 25 per cent. on hats.

THE RECIPROCITY TREATY AND ITS ABROGATION.

What produced the National Policy in this country? We had a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States for a period of ten years, from 1856 to 1866. At the time of its abrogation, what did the Americans say? They said we are establishing a protective policy; we think the best course to pursue is not to renew the Reciprocity Treaty, and they would not renew it. Then we had to do that which we thought best for ourselves. What did hon. gentlemen opposite do when they were in power? They sent Hon. George Brown to Washington at an expense of $6,000 to see if he could not bring about another Reciprocity Treaty. The Americans, however, said to him that he had better return to Canada, that they had a Reciprocity Treaty for ten years and did not want another, that they were very well satisfied with their trade policy, and when they wanted reciprocity with Canada they would let the Dominion know. It was when the hon. gentleman came back that the leader of the Conservative party, though he was in Opposition, asked hon. gentlemen to bring down a protective Tariff, and the Conservative party would assist them in carrying it out. When the ex-Finance Minister was urged to adopt this policy, he stood up in the House and said they were nothing but flies on the wheel of this great nation, and that it would be useless to attempt to do anything of this kind. As I said on a former occasion, they are nothing but flies on the wheel, and they are like all other flies. If you have a sore on your hand, first one fly

comes, then another, and another, until it is covered with flies, not for the purpose of trying to heal the sore, but to make it worse. If we have any little sore in the National Policy these gentlemen light upon it, not for the benefit of the country, but to run it down. (Cheers.) They told the people of this country that if this National Policy were brought in the people of the United States would retaliate, and that it would be disloyal to the mother country to bring down a Tariff which would put a duty on English goods the same as the duty on American goods.

WHY WE RETALIATED.

Have the people of the United States retaliated? Why did we bring down this policy? Because the United States had a protective policy averaging about 40 per cent. They had a ten rail fence all around their country in the way of a 40 per cent. tariff; we had a four rail fence in the way of a 17½ per cent. tariff. Their manufacturers could jump over our fence with their shoddy goods and jump back again with our money. But when our manufacturers tried to get over, they found the fence so high that they could not jump. We said, pull down your ten rail fence to our four, or else we will make ours a ten rail fence too. Is not that the way every farmer would act, and yet hon. gentlemen said they would retaliate. Yes, they are retaliating by saying: If you take the duty off our coal we will take the duty off yours. So far as the loyalty of this policy is concerned, protection has been tried over five years, and I will guarantee that the mother country consider us as loyal as hon. gentlemen opposite, and we can stand on the great Liberal Conservative platform and sing "God Save the Queen" with as much grace as they can, yes, even a little more, because we are talking in favour of Canada, and these hon. gentlemen are wound up half the time to sing "Yankee Doodle." (Laughter and cheers.) Now, Sir, you remember that on the 29th of January of this year, there was an election in Kent. It happened at the same time that an election trial was going on in Bothwell. In the town of Wallaceburg, there was a Young Men's Liberal Association, and about four weeks before the election in Kent, the hon. leader of the Opposition went there in order that the people might be educated as to the bad effects of the National Policy. I have his speech here, and I say it cannot be borne out by the facts, for I have the goods to prove that they are cheaper in Canada to-day, than before the National Policy. I wish to read an extract or two from the hon. gentleman's speech. I shall not take it out of the *Hansard*, but out of the *Hansard* of Kent, that is, the Chatham *Banner;* he said:

"I am told that it is a very different matter to go to a Conservative farmer, if he is an intelligent man, and discuss the beauties of the National Policy. There was a time when he was eager to boast of its achievements and to dilate on the benefits accruing therefrom. But now his ardor is somewhat cooled and he

is glad to whip up his horses and get away from the vicinity of his interrogator as speedily as possible. This is a good sign, and shows that men are beginning to see for themselves what they do not like to say—the falsity of the National Policy, the jugglery of the men who promised a period of undisturbed prosperity, and who, having attained to power, fail to redeem that pledge, and set about paving the way to retaining it contrary to the expressed will of a majority of the people."

This speech was reported on the 2nd of January, 1884. I happened to be in Kent on the 29th of January, election day, and I saw the farmers of Kent whipping up their horses to bring the voters to the polls for Henry Smith, the Conservative candidate, and they put him in by a larger majority than before. That, however, is not the point I wish to refer to.

DOES THE POOR MAN BEAR THE BURTHEN?

The hon. gentleman was discussing the duties on different goods, and endeavouring to prove to the Young Men's Liberal Association of Wallaceburg that the poor man is paying the burthen of duty, and the rich man is getting off scot free, or nearly so. What does he say?

"We have the item of blankets. A good article costing 63½ cents per pound is taxed 35 per cent., so that in order to get three you have to pay the price of four, or, if you bought in four, it cost you more than the price of the fourth blanket for the duty. Those at 17 pence, 40 per cent., and the cheaper article in more common use, 70 per cent. The goods in demand by the wealthy pay 35 per cent.; those used by the working classes pay 70 per cent—a most unrighteous discrimination. Who is it that pays the 70 per cent.? The man who is the least able and who is obliged to buy the poorer classes of goods. Who pays the least? The man whose circumstances enable him to pay the most. In ladies' jackets and mantles, too, they have a kind of sliding scale, illustrated by the following; Goods at 3s. 11d., 54 per cent.; 4s. 8d., 48 per cent.; 5s. 11d., 42 per cent.; 7s. 3d., 40 per cent.; 9s. 11d., 37 per cent.; 9s. 9d., 30 per cent.; 29s. 9d., 28 per cent. This is the Tariff as it affects woollens. I could go on and give you the cotton instances too, if time permitted. Now, if your Government had put on the Statute Book in words to this effect: Whereas it is desirable that an Act should be passed putting the burden of the taxes upon the poor to the exemption of the rich, therefore be it enacted that the cheaper classes of blankets be taxed 70 per cent. and the best blankets only pay 35 per cent.; and the cheaper classes of cloths pay 50 per cent., and the fine cloths only pay 23 per cent.; that the poorest carpets pay 36 per cent., and the rich goods only 20 per cent.; also that the poorer mantle cloths pay 54 per cent., and the high class cloths only 28 per cent. Suppose that if either Mr. Hawkins or Mr. Smith had voted for such a Bill you would have condemned him when he returned for re-election, for having sanctioned such an unjust and iniquitous measure. And because they knew you would, that is not the way they did it. They say the rich man shall buy a pound of cloth and pay so much; a poor man shall buy a pound and pay the same. But, gentlemen, it is kept in the back-ground that the rich man's pound is light and costly goods, while the poor man's is heavier and cheap."

We had the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) there too. I had the pleasure of listening to him, and I think he spoke a great deal better in the country than he does here. It seemed to me the other night that he was not really sure whether he was here representing the views of the majority of the people of Bothwell or not. I have heard the hon. gentleman illustrating this Protective Policy with his hat. He would say, "Gentlemen, there is a hat (holding it up). Suppose we had not the National Policy and I went into the United States, I would pay $1 for that hat; I would come over from Detroit to Windsor, and pay 17½ per cent., so that it would cost me $1.17½. Under this policy, however, I pay $1 for the hat in the States, I come over to Windsor and pay 25 per cent. duty, so that the hat would cost $1.25." Then his friends would cheer the hon. gentleman and say "that is splendid." But the 25 per cent. was not put there to burthen the poor man, but to give our manufacturers the home market for all kinds of goods they manufacture. Now, supposing that hat is made in Canada, and the Canadian maker can sell it for $1.20; another man comes, offers to make the same kind for $1.15; then, No. 3 brings the price down to a dollar; and another manufacturer still comes along and says, I will not allow the Americans to get this trade, and I will sell the hat for 90 cts. So home competition brings down the price. (Applause.) But that is not the best of it. Without this National Policy, we would be compelled to get these hats in the United States; and the manufacturers of hats would have all that country to sell their hats in, and would bring their surplus here. Now, without this policy, we would have to pay that dollar. Where would it go to? Every man knows that it would go to the United States. The hatter would pay the dollar to the wholesale man, the wholesaler would pay it to the retailer, the retailer to the labourer, the labourer to the butcher, the butcher to the farmer, the farmer to the blacksmith, and the blacksmith to someone else, and every man whose hands that dollar went through would make from 10 to 25 per cent., and it would benefit thousands of people in the United States. Where would the hat be? In Canada, and in six months it would be worn out, then we would have neither hat nor money. I have a hat that was bought in London at the rate of $4.50 a dozen, or three York shillings a piece. That hat can be sold for 50 cts., giving a profit of 33⅓ per cent.; and the result is that when that hat is worn out, the money is in the country, and the poor man can buy another with it. But the argument of the hon. gentleman is that the poor man has to pay this duty. Now, how is it? The poor man comes into a store where there is a hat for 50 cts., another for 75 cts., another for a dollar, and another for $1.25, all manufactured in Canada. But if he wants a finer hat, he takes a fine wool hat on which duty has been paid; and I say that if he buys a $4.00 hat, that is his business, and not the business of the Reform party of this country. The poor man is not compelled to buy that kind of a hat, but if he wants

a hat like the one the leader of the Opposition wears, and he pays his three or four dollars for it, that is his business, and not the business of the Reform party. (Applause.) Now, Sir, we will come to the question of a particular kind of cloth. The hon. gentleman, when talking to the people of West Kent, told them that the poor class of people paid 50 per cent. on their cloths, while the rich man paid only 23 per cent. Well, I had occasion to go to a factory in West Kent, and I said: "I want a yard of your heaviest cloth." There is the piece of cloth I got (holding it up). It has a pound of wool in it, and I paid 50 cts. a yard for it. It cost 30 cts. to manufacture it. Now, I would like to know where is the 50 per cent. paid on that piece of cloth. I will promise the hon. gentleman that if he or any of his supporters behind him—and there are a lot of merchants there—can stand up and show the house that there is 50 per cent. of duty paid on this kind of cloth, I will leave this side of the House, and go and support the hon. gentleman. Well, I explained this at a meeting in West Kent. After I got through, an old French gentleman came up to me and said: "Do you see that cloth in these pants?" slapping his hand on his leg. "My sheep grows that wool, my wife spins and my girl weaves it, and I would like to know how I pay 50 per cent. on that." What is the difference whether it is done on my farm, or at Mr. Taylor's factory in Chatham, it is all done in West Kent, and I would like these hon. gentlemen to show me how a cent of duty is paid on it. (Cheers.) But it is just like the case of the hat. A poor man goes into a store, and he sees different kinds of cloth there at from 60 cts. a yard to a dollar or $1.25, all manufactured in Canada, but if he must have Scotch goods or goods imported from other countries, then he pays the 23 per cent. the hon. gentleman spoke of. So that it is the rich man that pays 23 per cent. and the poor man does not pay anything at all. Now, we will carry this argument a little further. If the hon. gentlemen's argument were correct, then if the duty was 75 per cent., the poor man would have to pay 75 per cent. more for his cloth; if the duty was a dollar, the poor man would have to pay a dollar more; and if the cloth were prohibited altogether, then the hon. gentleman would have to go back to Wallaceburg and tell the boys there, "Unless you put us back in power before your last pair of breeches are worn out, you cannot get another pair, because cloth is prohibited from coming into the country." Then, of course, he would have to say: "Gentlemen, if I was wrong when I said in Nova Scotia that it took 9 yards to make a shirt, am I wrong now in telling you that you will have to take 9 yards for a shirt, after your pants are all worn out?" (Cheers.) Well, Sir, when we went to West Kent, we found that the Reform candidate and all the speakers for the Reform party were attacking the National Policy, just as it was attacked here by the leader of the Opposition. They all say the same thing. It puts me in mind of the two little boys who were quarrelling. One says it is so, and the other says it is not so, "Well, I tell you it is so," says the

first boy, " because mother says it is so, and when she says it is so, it is so, if it is not so." (Laughter.) That is just the way with hon. gentlemen opposite. They say it is so if Mr. Blake says it is so, because when he says it is so, it is so, if it is not so.

WHAT WEST KENT SAID.

It happens that West Kent sent to the Ontario Legislature a supporter of the Mowat Government, from 1879 to 1883, with a majority of 140. But the party were not satisfied with that majority, and at the general election they sent the Attorney-General to Chatham to have a grand mass meeting the night before the election. Well, they had a grand mass meeting ; the Attorney-General was there, and Mr. Meredith was there to meet him ; and the result was that the people of West Kent decided to send to the Ontario House a supporter of Mr. Meredith, with 400 majority. At the last general election of this House, Mr. Smith was elected by only 166 majority. His opponent, Mr. Sampson, was sick in bed, and it was said that if he had been up, he would have been elected. Well, there has since been another election, when the leader of the Opposition went to Wallaceburg, and the hon. member for Bothwell also went into the Riding to educate the people, so that they would be sure to send Mr. Sampson here with a large majority. Instead of Smith coming back with 166 of a majority, after the people heard from all these gentlemen, they sent him back with 283 of a majority. (Applause.) I do not pretend to say that I can argue constitutional law with the leader of the Opposition ; I do not pretend to say that I can argue Chancery law with the hon. gentleman ; I do not pretend that I have had the experience in public speaking, or the education he has had ; but I say that when I am talking about cloth and cottons, I know as much of what I am talking about as he knows when he is arguing a question of constitutional law. In the matter of law, I only have the theory, where he has the practice, but in the matter of these goods, he has the theory, and I have the practice. Now, he puts me in mind of Henry Ward Beecher. Henry Ward Beecher was a great preacher and a great theorist. He found out by reading and observation—he had read a great many books on farming and he made up his mind he would try the farming business—he found out by reading and observation that dried apples were worth more than green ones, so the first year he planted $1,500 worth of dried apples. It was a dry summer and the apples did not come up. The next thing he tried was pork. He bought a pig for $3 ; fed it with $25 worth of corn and sold it for $9 ; and then he said : I did not mind that so much, for though I lost a little on the corn, I made on the pig. The hon. gentleman argues theory and not from practice. I say he cannot show, nor can one of his supporters show, where the poor man pays a single cent of duty on the mass of goods worn by him. The hon. member for North Norfolk said the Finance Minister has

stated in this House that grey cottons were as cheap in Canada to-day as in Massachusetts, but he would like some one to show him that they are as cheap. I will give the hon. gentleman practical proof. Here is a piece of cotton manufactured in Canada, a yard wide. It does not take 9 yards of that to make a shirt either. (Cheers.) That cotton costs 5¾ cents a yard, and I defy anyone to show where he can get goods cheaper in the United States. Why cannot cotton be manufactured here as cheap as in the United States? The raw cotton is brought from the United States into Canada free, it is taken into the manufactories and there worked up; it is sold to the wholesale dealer who sells it to the retailer, and why should it not be sold here as cheap as in the United States?

COMPETITION REGULATES COST.

Competition is bringing it to a figure as cheap to-day as in the United States. These gentlemen said that the competition would not bring the prices down, did they not also say that the manufacturer would make 40 per cent? That the rich would get richer and the poor man poorer? Their policy was to make the rich man poorer and then starve the poor man to death. They told us that goods would be dearer. Did they not tell us that when we put 35 per cent. on cotton that cotton would cost the poor man 2 or 3 cents a yard more? Did not they tell us that nails, that sugar, that everything on which a duty was put, would cost the people more? Did they not tell us that people would have to pay more for agricultural implements? Now, the ex-Minister of Finance himself says: You are right when you say they are cheaper than ever before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not.

Mr. WIGLE. The hon. gentlemen said "hear, hear," when I said they were cheaper to-day than ever before. He said "hear, hear," when I said competition among the manufacturers brought the prices down. (Applause.) He cannot deny that. If he did not say it, he ought to say it. (Applause.) When the Conservative party were in Opposition, did they stand up here and whine at the Government and say your policy is wrong but we have nothing to propose? No; they stood up and said, your Revenue Tariff of 17½ per cent., under the circumstances, is not what we want. We want a Protective Policy, and if you do not give it to us, we will go to the people, and we went to the people with a platform. But when we ask these gentlemen what their platform is, what their principles are, what do they say! Principles—we have no principles; we are not in power. That is their whole action. While the hon. member for North Norfolk stated that the manufacturers were making 37 per cent., another hon. gentleman on that side said the competition among manufacturers was breaking them all down. I would be glad to know the manufacturers are making

a fair profit. I would much rather they made a good profit than see ourselves keeping up manufacturers in other countries. Foreign manufacturers do not manufacture goods for nothing for Canada, and why should we ask ours to do so? These gentlemen would rather read from the Blue Books of the United States that manufacturers there were making from 10 to 15 per cent., than read in our Blue Books that our own manufacturers were making the same profit. That is their policy. Our policy is to build up our manufactures, and we hope they will make good profits. Hon. gentlemen opposite, all through their speeches, have said this National Policy has caused so many manufacturers to extend their capital that it is ruining them. But that is their own business, if they choose to put their money into enterprises of this kind. We all take our risk. They go into the business with their eyes open, and if they come out unsuccessful, they cannot blame the Government. We all have the liberty to put our money into manufactures or to keep it out.

AFTER RECESS.

MUNICIPAL AND FEDERAL TAXATION.—THE DIFFERENCE.

In one portion of the hon. gentleman's speech (Mr. Blake) before the Young Men's Liberal Association in Wallaceburg, pointed to the Finance Minister of the present Conservative Government, and said: "Gentlemen, what would you think if a Reeve of your township would come before you for re-election, and would claim your support on the ground that he had a surplus of $5,000 from the last year?" He was arguing that the surplus of this Government was a wrong thing, and not a good thing for the country. He asked them what they would do if this Reeve, claiming he had a surplus of $5,000, asked them to elect him on that account. "You would ask him where he got his $5,000, and he would reply that he took it from the pockets of the people. Would you send a man like that back again as your representative in the County Council?" That was not a fair argument. The hon. gentleman ought to have told the young men of that association the truth of the case. He did not tell them that there was a great difference in the way municipal affairs were carried on, and the way Government affairs were carried on. He did not tell them that municipal affairs were carried on by direct taxation. Every man in this country knows that municipal affairs are not carried on in the way the affairs of Government are carried on. They know that applications are put in for money for different parts of the municipality, and on a certain day the assessor has the assessment roll completed, and all the municipal Reeve has to do is to figure up how much is appropriated and see how much the assessment is, and figure out so much on the dollar on the amount the township is assessed, and he need not have a surplus at all. On the other side, the Government have to

look to the future, and calculate as to imports and exports, and so on ; so it is very different. (Applause.) But, when he was putting this as he did, why did he not put it as it was, and say: "Gentlemen, this Finance Minister, the Finance Minister of the Conservative Government, left us this last year with a surplus of $6,000,000 ; the ex-Finance Minister, Mr. Cartwright left you with a deficit of $11,000,000 in five years ; which would you rather have to represent you, the one who left you with a surplus of $6,000,000, or the other who left you with a deficit of $11,000,000?" That would be the way to put it, if his argument was correct. (Cheers.) That is one part of the hon. gentleman's speech. I was just thinking it would be a fine thing for him to go over and make a speech to the American young Liberals against the National Policy there. Would it not be a nice thing for the hon. gentleman to stand up there and say to the young Liberals in the United States: "Boys, see here, the Government of the United States have put 35 cents a pound duty on leaf tobacco coming from Canada, and so you will have to pay 35 cents a pound more for your tobacco." Why, they would say, every little boy would say : "That is not so ; I can buy tobacco here for 5 cents a pound." Suppose he said the poor man's clothing cost 60 per cent. more because of the tariff on coarse goods from Canada or England, they would say : "No ; we have no Canadian or English goods here for the poor man ; we manufacture our own goods, we grow our own wool and make our own clothes, and we do not pay a single cent duty." This speech of the hon. gentleman, where he tells the people that the poor man has to pay 50 per cent. on cloth, and 70 per cent. on other goods, 54 per cent. on mantle cloth, and so on, would not that be a fine speech for a pamphlet for an American emigration agent in foreign countries?

WHY THE UNITED STATES OBJECTS.

I imagine I see an American emigration agent in a foreign country saying: "The United States is the place to go to. It is true that we have protection and that they have protection in Canada, but the protection that we have is not the same as they have in Canada. In the United States we protect the poor man. He pays nothing for his coarse cloths in the way of duty, but here is the Hon. Edward Blake's speech, the leader of the Reform party in Canada, and he says it is the poor man who pays for the protection in Canada. Go to the United States, where the poor man is protected and the rich man has to pay the duty, and not to Canada, where the poor man has to pay all the burdens." Would not that be a nice pamphlet for a Yankee emigration agent? What do we find in the Boston *Herald*? The Boston *Herald* says Canada is over-protected, that the high protection has made agricultural implements dearer than before the National Policy ; and what do they give? They give the *Globe* for their authority. There would be another nice little sheet to put in the American emigration pamphlet,

to read in foreign countries. (Applause.) Why is it the Americans always copy from the Reform papers? It is because they are always running Canada down, and the average American editor would rather that his people should read that Canada was lagging behind the United States than that she was coming even with the United States, under her policy. It would not do for us all to see alike; I admit that. It is necessary to have an Opposition. There were some ministers of the Gospel once discussing this question, and one said: "It would not do for us all to see alike; if we had all seen alike, if everyone had seen with my eyes, every person would have been after my wife." (Laughter.) Another said: "Yes, that is so; but, if everyone had seen as I see, no one would have been after her." (Renewed laughter.) That is just the same with the Reform party. If everyone saw as hon. gentlemen opposite see, everyone would have gone for a 17½ per cent. revenue Tariff, and we would have had a deficit every year; but, if everyone had seen as the vast majority of the people have seen during the last two general elections, there would not be an hon. gentleman on that side of the House opposing this Government. That would not be right. We want them there. It makes the people in the country feel better to know there is an Opposition to any Government. (Cheers.) I will tell you what I believe put those gentlemen out of power. It was their Finance Minister, now the ex-Finance Minister; and that puts me in mind of another comparison. A lady applied to a child for something for charitable purposes. "No," she said, "we cannot afford it, our father is poor, he was a merchant, but he took a bad two dollar bill and failed." So with these gentlemen; they took a bad two dollar bill, in the person of the member for Huron, and failed, and I am afraid they will never get back as long as he is their financier. Under this policy, there have been over 600 organs, made by Bell & Co., sold in Europe during last year, and in West Kent we find there was a capital stock of $100,000 taken, and that was on condition that there was to be a waggon works started there if the National Policy was adopted and the Conservative party returned to power in 1882. They were returned on the 20th June, 1882, and on the next day they commenced hauling the bricks, and in less than four months from that time they were building 70 waggons per week; and while the farmers in that part of the country were paying $60 to $65 before this shop commenced, they are now paying from $49.50 in cash up to $55, on a year's time. That shows the benefit of the National Policy. (Applause.)

Mr. MILLS. But it is closed up.

Mr. WIGLE. Yes; and I will tell you the reason why. They were making seventy waggons per week. The hon. gentleman said the other day that times were not as good in the western part of this Province as they were before the National Policy, and that is true; but he did not tell the reason. In the first place, our wheat was not half a

crop in that country; the frost last year killed the wheat. In the next place, that country depends mostly on the corn crop, more especially in Kent and Essex, and the early frost killed the corn, the first time in 60 years, and the result was that we did not have corn to fatten hogs, and that is the reason why times were hard there. When corn is killed, that touches the farmer, and as the farmer is the man who buys these waggons, you now have the reason why that factory closed down. We all know that we are in a depressed state at the present time, but we all know this: that we will get out of it with the National Policy a great deal sooner than we would without it.

"THE RING OF MANUFACTURERS."

Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite have said that the manufacturers of this country had formed a ring, that the manufacturers of cotton had formed a ring, and that after the surplus that they had on hand was worked off, they would run up the price, and we would have to pay whatever they charged. Well, would not that apply to any other country? Would it not apply to this country, if we had Free Trade? Do they not form rings in the United States, and could they not form rings in Free Trade England, where there are more factories in any industry than are needed? That is no argument at all. We find that the cheap goods are those that the poor man uses. Why has the poor man been able to increase his earnings in the savings bank? It is because, instead of having to pay 17½ per cent. on his cloth, he gets it without paying any duty; instead of paying 17½ per cent. on his boots and his shoes, he gets them here at home without paying any duty, and so with everything else. He gets his tea free of duty, his coffee free of duty, and the result is that he saves more money and puts more into the savings bank than he did before. (Applause.) Now, if these hon. gentlemen say that the National Policy has not cheapened goods, that the poor man has to pay as high as 50 and 75 per cent. for many of the goods he buys, why do not they propose their remedy? Why do they not stand up and say: "Here is a piece of cloth, and we intend to reduce the duty on it. Here is a piece of grey cotton, here is a blanket, and we want the duty taken off." They are not ready to do so. Why do they not bring these things up and then we can discuss them? The hon gentleman, in talking about blankets, said the poor man paid 70 per cent. on his blankets. I have a letter here from a manufacturer where he says that he will make blankets, 60 by 80, with a pound of good, pure wool in them, and sell them for 50 cents a pound and a grey blanket for 45 cents a pound. Now here is a pound of good, pure wool in that blanket, 20 cents for the wool and 30 for the manufacturer. Now let the hon. gentleman say where the poor man pays 70 per cent. on that blanket. It applies to everything else in the same way. Of course, I admit, if we sent to the United States and bought blankets, we would have to pay 70 per cent. on them, but we don't do that. We first find out the price of the article in the foreign

country, and then the price in our own country, and if we find it cheaper in our own country, we will not go into the foreign country to buy it. The hon. gentleman from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) said in his speech, that goods were dearer now than before the National Policy. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman certainly does not know what he is talking about when he says that. Every man in this House knows that he can buy boots and shoes cheaper now than at any time since Confederation. (Cheers.) Every man knows that he can buy sugars, teas, ready-made clothing, and everything cheaper than he could before the National Policy. (Cheers.) Now, Sir, one of the Reeves in the county I have the honour to represent, who is one of the strongest Reformers in that county, said to me a while ago: "How is it that times are so hard now? We haven't so much money as before. You told us the National Policy would be a good thing for us." I said, well, let me ask you this: have you any wheat to sell? It is worth $1 per bushel. He said, no. This gentleman is a farmer, he has 100 acres, and is worth $6,000 or $7,000. He said he had no wheat to sell. I said, have you any dressed pork to sell? It is worth $7.50 per hundred. He said, no. I asked him, have you any dressed beef to sell? It is worth $9 a hundred. He said, no. I said, have you any beans to sell? They are worth $1.75 per bushel. He said, no. Have you any potatoes to sell? They are worth 60 cents per bushel. He said, no. Have you any peas? "No." Well, I said, what are you blaming the National Policy for, if you have nothing to sell? (Applause.) Now, I said to him, I will take you in another way. Do you want to buy any cotton? It is cheaper than it ever was before. He said, no. I said, do you want to buy a suit of clothes cheaper than you could ever buy them before? He said, no. I said, what is the reason? Why, he said, I have no money to buy with. He had nothing to sell, and consequently he had nothing to buy with. When they have poor crops and have no money, some people blame the National Policy for it. (Cheers.) But if we have a good crop another year, I guarantee that you will see the National Policy come out all right.

SIGNIFICANT FACTS.

Now, Sir, I cannot understand how it is that hon. gentlemen who pretend to have good common sense should stand up here and denounce the National Policy, and say that it makes prices of manufactured goods higher, that the poor man has to buy. I say the high duty was put on, not for the purpose of making the poor man pay higher for the goods he buys, but to keep the American shoddy out of this country, and to give our own manufacturers a chance to make their living. Any man ought to see that who has got good common sense. I am surprised to hear these gentlemen talk such nonsense. A gentleman who is well known up west was asking why so many people left this

country, and he instanced a man named John Hardy. He said that John Hardy went to the North-West and bought land and stayed there a short time, but he found that he had to pay such a high duty on agricultural implements that he would not stay there any longer, and so he went over into the United States, where he could buy these things cheaper than in Canada. Well, this story was told at an election meeting in favour of the candidate, who was a friend of the hon. gentleman from Bothwell, and a gentleman came up and told me that he knew all about this same John Hardy. He said John Hardy did go into the United States and he told him he made the greatest mistake he ever made in his life. He said the reason why he went into the United States was because the Reform papers and the Reform party in this country said that we would never get the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that his land in the North-West would not be worth 5 cents an acre without a Railway. (Applause.) But now, he said, after they had built the railway, he was satisfied that he had made the greatest mistake he ever made in his life, and while he was telling that another gentleman stepped up and said: "Yes, and this same John Hardy is one of the 11,000 Canadians who have returned to live under the old flag." (Cheers.) It is not necessary for me to say more on this subject. I could bring forward many more facts to strengthen my case; but before I sit down, I desire to read what the American Consul at Port Sarnia said about the protective policy. Consul Pace, in November, 1883, said:

"To say that Canada has not been benefitted by the policy of Protection would be to ignore facts in the outset. At this point is shipped, by a tri-weekly line of steamers, the implements of agriculture and tools of trade which are destined to play an important part in the development of Canada's great north-western possessions. These products of the loom, the anvil, the furnace, the field, the workshop, and the factory are all the products of Canadian industry. Take away the Tariff, and a more convenient market would doubtless be found for the pioneers of the British territory; but the factories and workshops of Ontario, which are now crowded to their fullest capacity, would have to close their doors and discharge their artisans."

That is the report he made to the American Government. No wonder the Americans keep up their National Policy. I have shown different articles manufactured in Canada which I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to say were manufactured cheaper before the National Policy was adopted. I would like them to take cloth, and demonstrate to the people that the poor man really pays 50 per cent. duty on it, or any duty at all. (Prolonged cheering and applause.)